

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,685	04/21/2004	Robert P. Bourdelais	87933PAL	4468
7590 05/01/2006			EXAMINER	
Paul A. Leipold			HESS, BRUCE H	
Patent Legal Staff Eastman Kodak Company			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
343 State Street			1774	
Rochester, NY 14650-2201			DATE MAILED: 05/01/2006 \	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	A 44 45 A4	A 11 //)			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary	10/828,685	BOURDELAIS ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	Bruce H. Hess	1774			
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status		la.			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3-16-06 (Amendment)					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	yn from consideration. 5				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Serion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🔲 Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/828,685

Art Unit: 1774

1. Claims 1, 3-21, 32, 34 and 35 are allowed.

2. Claim 29 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

base claim and any intervening claims.

3. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 USC 112 (2) as being indefinite since it cannot be

determined if the copolymer is actually cross-linked.

H. Claims 22-28, 30 and 31 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over the patent to Taniguchi et al.

This patent teaches the equivalence of seventeen resins including polyester,

polyurethane and polycarbonate as dye receiving material. While copolymers of these

resins are suggested and the advantages of cross-linking are discussed, there is no

recognition that a particular cross-linked copolymer (i.e., polyester/polyurethane)

selected from this group of seventeen resins provides superior results (see Table 1 in

the specification). Claims 22-28, 30 and 31 are not commensurate in scope with this

showing since the copolymer is not cross-linked.

BHUCE H. HESS

Bure Here

Page 2